DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 448 805 JC 010 075

TITLE	Instructional Program Review Process.
INSTITUTION	Austin Community Coll., TX.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	17p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Outcomes Assessment; Community Colleges; Educational Quality; *Evaluation Methods; *Institutional Evaluation; Program Effectiveness; *School Effectiveness; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Austin Community College TX

ABSTRACT

The report describes the Instructional Program Review Process at Austin Community College (Texas). The report includes program review process timeline and schedule. The Instructional Program Review Process focuses on issues of need, cost, and effectiveness of instructional programs. It provides for identification of improvements, includes standards of academic quality, and allows for better decision-making, including modifications, budget, strategic planning. In consultation with the administration, Deans determine the order in which programs in their areas will be reviewed. Each dean will designate a self-study team for each instructional area. The selection will be based on recommendations from the Program Coordinator or Taskforce Chair. The Chair is the key member of the self-study team. The Chair's responsibility begins during the spring term prior to the self-study and continues through the next academic year until the final self-study report has been submitted. The basis of the program review process is the analysis of information relating to a set of core indicators. These core indicators have been identified by the Program Review Work Group and reflect the input from a variety of sources. They include indicators federal, state, and regional agencies, as well as "best practices" identified in similar processes at other community colleges. The core indicators are presented in three sets, categorized by need, cost, and program effectiveness. (JA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 448 805

Austin Community College
Instructional Program Review Process

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Osburn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JC010075

Instructional Program Review Process

Overview

The **Instructional Program Review Process** focuses on aspects of need, cost and effectiveness of instructional programs. Specifically, is the instructional quality of the program high enough to meet institutionally set standards?

What is a program?

For purposes of program review, a program is an organizational unit within the college that provides instructional or support services. These include instructional disciplines, degree and credentialing, and non-instructional services, including non-classroom instructional services. The process outlined here focuses on instructional areas.

Purpose of Program Review Process

- Continuous improvement of programs
- Assessment of strengths and weaknesses of a program as well as the opportunities and threats it faces.
- Determination of the capabilities of the program/area
- Break down barriers between areas of operation
- Ensure best uses of resources—fiscal, human, facilities, equipment, technology
- Articulate program's mission and vision
- Provide the foundation for application to the Greater Austin Quality Council (Baldrige Criteria)
- Responds to Board policy

Characteristics of Program Review Process

The Instructional Program Review Process at Austin Community College:

- Provides for identification of improvements
- Includes standards of academic quality
- Allows for better decision-making, including modifications, budget, strategic planning
- Is integrated into the Institutional Effectiveness process
- Is integrated into other external review process, including the THECB site review, SACS accreditation, program-specific reviews required by other agencies
- Ensures customer focus integrated into program
- Creates an opportunity for broad-based input from constituencies including students, staff, faculty, employers

- Is a cyclical process with the expectation that there will be continuous review within the program
- Assesses the degree to which the program is fulfilling its mission and accomplishing its goals

Administration of the Instructional Program Review Process

Oversight of the Program review process in the instructional areas is the responsibility of the **Instructional Program Review Committee**. Membership includes one faculty member from each dean area. Appointments are made biennially and members serve for 2 years. The Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness serves as an ad hoc member. This Committee is chaired by a member of the Committee selected by the Executive Vice President for Instruction.

The responsibilities of the Instructional Program Review Committee include:

- Overseeing the Program Review Process to ensure that it occurs within the stated timeline
- Monitoring of the implementation of the Program Review Process
- Providing assistance to units involved in the process
- Evaluating the overall process
- Developing modifications as necessary to ensure the process functions effectively
- Developing modifications of the Indicators of Effectiveness, including related criteria, as needed
- Reviewing self-study reports

Guidelines for Implementation

In consultation with the administration, Deans determine the order in which programs in their areas will be reviewed

New programs will be incorporated into the timeline as they are developed. In most cases, program review will not occur during the first 3 years of program implementation.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will provide data related to the program review. Specific types of information are indicated below.

Self Study Team

Each Dean will designate a Self-study Team for each instructional area. The selection will be based on recommendations from the Program Coordinator or Taskforce

Chair. The primary responsibilities of the Self-study Team are to collect and analyze the information, develop the Self-study Report, and make recommendations.

It is anticipated that the Team will meet on a regular basis during the fall semester. These meetings may be augmented with discussions via email or telephone.

The Chair is the key member of the Self-study Team. The Chair's responsibility begins during the Spring Term prior to the Self-study and continues through the next academic year until the final Self-study report has been submitted.

The membership of the Self-study Team will include:

Member	**#**	**Role**
Chair	1	-Coordinates Self-study -Coordinates departmental surveys and focus groups -Provides motivation and direction to the Self-study Team -Sets meeting schedule -Moderates discussions -Coordinates development of the drafts of the Self-study Report -Submits report as required -Acts as liaison with the Dean, Task Force/Program, Instructional Program Review Committee and Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Full time faculty-in discipline	1-3	-Participates in discussions -Assists with collection and analysis of information -Assists with the development of the Self-study Report, including writing sections as needed
Adjunct faculty-in discipline	1-2	-Participates in discussions -Assists with collection and analysis of information -Assists with the development of the Self-study Report
Full time faculty-not in discipline	1-2	-Participates in discussions -Provides insight into relationship of service courses to the instructional area under review, including the collection and analysis of information -Assists with the development of the Self-study Report
Students (current and/or former)	1-2	-Participates in discussions -Provides insight from student perspective -Assists with the development of the Self-study Report
Community members/external consultant	1-2	-Participates in discussions -Provides insight from the perspective of business, industry, or other college/university -Assists with the development of the Self-study Report
Dean (ex officio)	1	-Participates in discussions, but not in writing of Self-study Report

External consultants may be included as part of the program review process. The Dean in consultation with the appropriate Associate Vice President and Taskforce Chair/Program Coordinator will make the determination.

Program review process

This timeline is to serve as a guide. Modifications may need to be made based on institutional constraints.

Prior to starting review

Instructional Program Review Committee members identified by instructional Executive Vice President

Guidelines for Instructional Program Review developed

Training for Instructional Program Review Committee members and Self-study Team developed

Spring I – Summer I

Programs to undergo review notified (January)

Instructional Program Review Committee meets with Program Coordinators/Taskforce Chairs to review process

Program/Task Force identifies Self-study Team membership and makes recommendations to the Dean.

Dean reports membership of Self-study Team to Instructional Program Review Committee

Surveys of students, faculty, employers, etc. conducted by Program/Task Force and/or Self-study Team

Data on indicators provided by Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Fall I

Self-study Team conducts self-study, with assistance from the Instructional Program Review Committee

Self-study Team reviews draft Self-study report and recommendations with Program/Task Force and Dean

Institutional Effectiveness Measures reviewed and revised

Implications for strategic planning, operation planning, and budgeting determined

Taskforce Chair/Program Coordinator proposes Action Plans to address recommendations

Self-study Report completed by December 15

Self-study sent to Instructional Program Review Committee for review of completeness and quality

Self-study sent to Dean for review of results

Spring II

Preliminary Self-study Report reviewed with Dean and Associate Vice President (January)

Associate Vice President and instructional Executive Vice President review the Self-study Report

If necessary, Self-study Team revises Self-study Report

Associate Vice President incorporates recommendations into institutional planning and budgeting processes

By April 15, Dean files final Self-study Report Associate Vice President and the instructional Executive Vice President

Summary of Self-study Report prepared by Self-study Chair and Dean presented to Board of Trustees (Information Item)

Spring III

Progress report completed by Taskforce Chair/Program Coordinator as part of institutional effectiveness process

Program Review Schedule

In consultation with the administration, area Deans are responsible for determining the order in which programs will be evaluated. During the first cycle, programs will be reviewed as indicated in the chart below. The Instructional Program Review Committee will consult with the Deans each fall prior to notifying programs.

Dean Area	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003
Applied Technologies, Multimedia, and Public Service	Photography Commercial Art Printing Commercial Music	ACR Criminal Justice Fire Protection Automotive	BCT Welding Child Development	Human Services Technical Communications
Computer Studies and Advanced Technology	Quality Assurance CIS/CSC ELN	EDG	SMT CER	SRV
Business Studies	OST FNM BMG MGT	Marketing Fashion Real Estate	Accounting Legal	Travel Hospitality Culinary Arts
Health Sciences	DMS MLT DMR	OTA SRG PTA	PHR FIT (PFT) EMS AHS	VNG NSG
Math and Sciences	Mathematics (including Developmental) Chemistry	Engineering Physics	Biology Physical Science Geology	Astronomy Health & Kinesiology
Social and Behavioral Sciences	History	Anthropology Geography Economics	Psychology Sociology Human Development Women's Studies	Government
Arts and Humanities	Developmental Reading Developmental Writing English as a Second Language	Foreign Languages Radio-TV-Film	English Speech Journalism	Art Dance Drama Music Philosophy/ Religion Humanities

Modifications to this schedule may be made in consultation with the instructional Executive Vice President. Where programs are closely related, one Self-study Team may be appointed to review multiple programs. This should be coordinated with the Dean and Associate Vice President. In these cases, the membership of the Self-study Team may be expanded and must include at least one full-time faculty member from each area under review.

Indicators of Effectiveness

The basis of the Program Review Process is the analysis of information relating to a set of Core Indicators. These Core Indicators have been identified by the Program Review Work Group and reflect input from a variety of sources. They include indicators federal, state and regional agencies, including SACS, the LBB, and the THECB, as well as "best practices" identified in similar processes at other community colleges.

As part of the Self-study process, Self-study Teams in consultation with the Dean and Instructional Program Review Committee will select the indicators on which their analysis will focus. The only exception to this is a set of required indicators that are defined by SACS, the LBB, the THECB, other agencies, and/or institutional priorities. These are noted in parenthesis in the tables below.

Codes are as follows:

SOURCE
P = Provided in Documentation Notebook
I = Instructional area must provide

PRIORITY
R = Required
O = Optional
A = All instructional areas
W = Workforce
T = Transfer

The Core Indicators are organized into three sets--Need, Cost, and Program Effectiveness--defined as follows:

Need: Does the program address a verifiable need of students, the community, or society?

Cost: Within the context of the College's mission, is the cost of the program justified?

Program Effectiveness: Are the teaching, learning, course, program, student and student support outcomes of this program of the best possible quality?

NEED

Does the program address a verifiable need of students, the community, or society?

Need

Src	Pri	Core Indicators	Type of data/information
P	R-A	Enrollment trends (previous 5 years)	Student enrollment in courses
P	R-A		Number of sections offered
	R-W		Number of declared majors (beginning when Degree Audit is implemented)
P	R-A	Graduates (previous 3 years)	Number of degrees conferred {THECB, LBB}
P	R-W	Outcomes (previous 3 years)	Percent of graduates who are employed with in one year of graduation {THECB}
P	R-A		Number and Percent of graduates who Transfer with in one year of graduation {THECB, LBB}
P	R-W		Percent of employed graduates who indicate employment is related to training (ACC Survey of Graduates)
P/I	O-A		Analysis of courses transferred
I	O-W	Labor market opportunities	Labor market information
P/I			Employer input—Survey, focus groups
I	O-A	Competition from other institutions	Other options for students in the Service Delivery Area

COST

Within the context of the College's mission, is the cost of the program justified?

Cost

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
I	O-A	Budget analysis (previous 2 years)	Analysis of actual expenditure related to program compared to budget
P	R-A	Comparative program costs (previous 2 years)	Ratio of non-faculty program costs to contact hours generated
P	R-A	Program costs (previous 2 years)	Cost per contact hour consistent with type of instruction

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Are the teaching, learning, course, program, student and student support outcomes of this program of the best possible quality?

Student Achievement

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
P	R-A	Course completion rates	Withdrawal rates for courses {SACS, THECB, LBB} D-F-W rates within college norms
P	R-A	Program (degree/certificate) completion	Number of students completing degree/certificate requirements {THECB, LBB}
I	O-A	Capstone assessment	Number/Percent of students completing capstone experience {THECB}
P/I	O-W	Licensure pass rates	Percent of graduates passing licensure exams {THECB, LBB}
P	O-A	Student transfer rates	Number of students transferring {THECB, LBB}
I	O-A	Comparison with external norms	Pass rates on nationally normed tests {SACS}

Student Retention

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
P P	R-A	Course retention rates within college norms	Withdrawal rates for courses {LBB} D-F grade rates within college norms
P	R-W	Completion rates of declared major with intent to complete a degree/certificate	Number of declared majors intending to complete a program who complete degree/certificate requirements with in 6 years {THECB, IPEDS}

Student Outcomes

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
P P/I	R-W	Employment of graduates within THECB standards	Jobs placement rates from THECB follow-up {THECB, LBB} Employment related to program from ACC survey of graduates
P ———	R-T O-T	Transfer of graduates/course completers	Number of course takers transferring with in one year Number of course takers who indicate intent to transfer who do transfer with in one year of leaving ACC (When intent data are available)

P/I	R-T		GPA of transfer students at transfer institution
P	R-W	Meet THECB standards for number of Graduates	Number of program graduates in 3 years {THECB}
I	O-A	Determination of proficiency levels	Departmental student assessment (e.g., departmental final exams, exit tests, standardized testing, etc.)

Access

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
P	R-A	Course availability	Analysis of when and where courses are offered by campus, time of day, mode of delivery
P	R-A	Extent to which courses meet student demand	Number of sections taught by location
P			Number of sections closed/cancelled by course
P			High demand course analysis
I	O-A	Marketing of program/courses	Program brochures
I			Description of program and institutional outreach activities
P	O-A	Access by various types of students	Demographics of students taking courses
P	R-W		Demographics of students with declared majors and intent to complete program {THECB}
I	O-A	Accessibility of course content	Student course evaluation questions related to course content
P	R-W	Length of time it takes to complete program	Average number of semesters it takes for students to gain degree/credential

Curriculum and Instruction

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
I	R-W	Currency of program/course content	Date of most recent program revision {THECB}
I	R-A		Course texts up-to-date {THECB}
I	R-A	Learning outcomes defined	Learning outcomes defined for courses and programs {THECB}
I	R-A	Course syllabi	All courses have up-to-date syllabi on file {SACS, THECB}

I	O-A		Number of courses with departmental syllabi
I	R-A	Faculty credentials	All faculty meet SACS standards {SACS, THECB}
I	O-A	Faculty satisfaction	Rate of faculty turnover
I	O-A		Focus groups/surveys
P	R-A	Number of faculty adequate to teach courses	Percent of sections taught by full-time faculty
P			Percent of contact hours taught by full time faculty {LBB}
I	O-A	Faculty professional development	Number involved in formal professional development activities
I			Types of discipline-related professional development activities offered
I	R-A	Teaching effectiveness	Student evaluations of instruction within acceptable range
P	R-A		Extent to which alternative modes of instruction are incorporated into classes
I	O-A		Extent to which focus of instruction is on problem solving, active learning, and work-based elements
I	R-W	External advisory committee input	Committee meets regularly to discuss curriculum issues
I	R-W		Most recent review of curriculum by external advisory committee {THECB}
I	O-A	Equipment assessment	Assess area use of instructional equipment {THECB}
I	O-A		Extent to which courses rely on specific equipment
I	R-A	Technology assessment	Extent to which technology impacts mode of instruction
P	R-A		Number of courses/sections taught via distance learning
I	O-A		Number of courses/sections that incorporate multi-media
I	O-A		Number of courses/sections taught using alternative instructional methodology

I	R-A	Assessment of instructional resources	Evaluation of the use of instructional resources including those in the LRS
I	O-A	Support courses meet the needs of other disciplines and programs	Extent to which courses are required by other courses and programs
I	O-A		Pre-requisite tracking—how students perform in subsequent courses
I	O-A		Input from other programs and disciplines regarding learning outcomes and student performance
P	O-A	Appropriateness of course pre-requisites	Analysis of course completion data
I	O-A		Analysis of course competencies, Work Keys, DACUM, ACAP, etc.
I	O-A		Analysis of scope and sequence of curriculum
I	O-A	Course effectiveness	Departmental course assessment (e.g., exit tests, surveys, standardized testing, syllabus review, etc.)
I	R-A	Catalog content up to date	Analysis of course and program listings in ACC catalog
I	R-W	SCANS incorporated into program	Analysis of documentation of the curriculum {THECB}

Diversity

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
P	R-A	Student diversity	Demographics of students taking courses
——	R-W		Demographics of students indicating intent to complete program (Available when intent data are accessible)
I	O-A	Faculty diversity	Demographics of full time and adjunct faculty
I	O-A	Outreach activities	Activities to reach under-represented populations
P	R-W	Diversity of graduates	Demographics of graduates (LBB, THECB}

Student Satisfaction

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
I	R-A	Satisfaction of students with courses	Student course evaluations
P	R-W	Satisfaction of graduates with program	ACC Graduate Survey data
I	O-A		Area surveys

Employer Satisfaction

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
P	R-W	Employment of graduates	Percent of graduates employed with in one year {THECB}
P	R-W	Employer satisfied with program completers' proficiency	Percent of employers indicating satisfaction with graduates {THECB}
I	O-W		Focus group or internal survey of employers
I	O-W	Employers satisfied with number of program completers	Number of employers indicating need for more graduates

Transfer Institution Satisfaction

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
I	R-T	Satisfaction of transfer institutions	Survey/focus group of transfer institutions {THECB}
P	O-A		Data from transfer institutions
P	O-A	Level of student transfer	Number of students transferring successfully {THECB}
I	R-T	Transfer articulation agreements	Number of agreements with universities and colleges {THECB}
I	R-T	Extent to which courses transfer	Number of courses which transfer
I	R-T		Number of students who contact college about problems with course transfer

Institutional Effectiveness

		Core Indicators	Type of data/information
P	R-A	Institutional Effectiveness Measures	Institutional effectiveness measures and results for past 3 years {SACS}
I	R-A		Extent to which measures reflect required learning outcomes

Instructional Program Review Process

The Self-study begins with an analysis of the information listed above. The Self-study Team then considers the following:

Review of Mission/Vision

The Mission of the instructional area will be reviewed to ensure that it continues to reflect the need for the program/discipline.

Identification of Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

As part of the Self-study, the program will conduct a SWOT to determine the strategic priorities that need to be addressed. The data collected in the Need, Cost, and Program Effectiveness sections form the basis for the SWOT.

Integration of Baldrige Criteria (optional)

Programs interested in using quality-based criteria or pursing one of the quality awards may do so as part of the Program Review process. Specific information is available through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

This process is coordinated by the Greater Austin Quality Council (GAQC), which is a component of the Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce. The GAQC program offers public recognition and private assessments, via the Greater Austin Quality Awards, to organizations in the Greater Austin Region for quality and performance excellence.

Using the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award criteria, private written assessments (Feedback Reports), which describe an organization's strengths and areas for improvement as measured and with performance excellence criteria are the major features of the program.

The core values and concepts of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality are embodied in seven categories:

1. Leadership
2. Strategic Planning
3. Customer and Market Focus
4. Information and Analysis
5. Human Resource Focus
6. Process Management
7. Business Results

Recommendations

The Self-study Team should identify the major issues that need to be addressed as a result of information gathered during the self-study process. It should then identify what will be done to address the issues identified. In most cases, 5 to 10 recommendations will be made.

Action Plans

As part of the Self-study, the Taskforce/Program must develop Action Plans for each Recommendation. Action Plans are proposals for change and may serve as guidelines for future planning activities.

Institutional Effectiveness Measures

In addition, at least three Institutional Effectiveness Measures need to be identified and included as part of the Self-study Report. Assistance on developing these can be provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Implications for the Budget Process

The Taskforce Chair/Program Coordinator should develop an outline of operational planning priorities for next budget cycle. This should be shared with the Dean and Associate Vice President during the budget process.